

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Claims 5-10 and 14-17 have been previously withdrawn. Thus, claims 1-4 and 11-13 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

In the Office Action mailed June 7, 2006, the title was objected to as not being descriptive of the invention to which the claims are drawn, and claims 1, 2 and 4 were objected to for informalities. The title and claims 1, 2 and 4 have been amended responsive to the objections. If any additional amendment is necessary to overcome the objections, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative.

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-3, 11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,426,583 to Onishi et al. (hereinafter "Onishi"), U.S. patent No. 5,731,584 to Beyne et al. (hereinafter "Beyne"), and U.S. Patent No. 4,426,595 to Kawaura et al. (hereinafter "Kawaura"). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onishi, Kawaura and Beyne, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,143 to Romanofsky. It is noted that claims 1-2 have been amended. To the extent that the rejections remain applicable to the claims currently pending, the Applicants hereby traverse the rejections, as follows.

The Applicants' invention, as recited in amended claim 1 is described, for example, by the process shown in Figs. 10A through 10G of the specification as filed.

In the Applicants' invention as recited in amended claim 1, a supporting substrate is joined to a piezoelectric substrate and a first surface of the piezoelectric substrate opposite the surface joined to the supporting substrate is grinded and polished. Next, an on-chip pattern including comb-shaped electrodes and electrode pads is formed on the grinded and polished piezoelectric substrate, and the supporting substrate is grinded and polished.

In contrast, in Figs. 9A through 9E of Onishi, the substrates 101a and 102a are joined as shown in Fig. 9A, and are respectively grinded and polished, as shown in Fig. 9B. Then, the patterns 104 and 105 are formed on the grinded substrate 101a. However, Onishi does not teach or suggest joining a supporting substrate to a second surface of a piezoelectric substrate opposite to a first surface; grinding and polishing the first surface of the piezoelectric substrate; forming, on the first surface of the piezoelectric substrate, an on-chip pattern including comb-shaped electrodes and electrode pads; and grinding and polishing a third surface of the supporting substrate opposite to another surface of the supporting substrate to which the second surface of the piezoelectric substrate is joined, as recited in independent claim 1, as amended.

Beyne, Kawaura and Romanofsky are not cited for, nor do they teach or suggest the deficiencies of Onishi noted above.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a rejected claim, the applied art of record must teach or suggest each feature of a rejected claim. See *M.P.E.P.* §2143.03 and *In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998). As explained above, none of the applied art of record, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every feature recited in independent claim 1. Therefore,

independent claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the combination of Onishi, Beyne, Kawaura and Romanofsky.

For at least this reason, the Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable over the applied art of record. As claim 1 is allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 2-4 and 11-13, which depend from allowable claim 1, are likewise allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-4 and 11-13 are in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowability is earnestly solicited.


Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this

communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing client matter number
025720-00027.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox, PLLC


Michele L. Connell
Registration No. 52,763

Customer No. 004372
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6104
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395

MLC:ksm

Enclosure: Petition for Extension of Time (one month)